

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

A-9

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/914,536 08/19/97 STEVENSON

M STEVE-106

┌

IM22/1206

└

EXAMINER

CAMERON, E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1762

11

DATE MAILED:

12/06/99

JOSEPH C. ANDRAS, ESQ.  
LAW OFFICES OF JOSEPH C. ANDRAS  
650 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 650  
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/914,536

Applicant(s)

Stevenson et al

Examiner

Erma Cameron

Group Art Unit

1762



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 15-17, 20, and 39-55 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 15-17, 20, and 39-55 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1762

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 15-17, 20 and 39-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A) Claim 1, (a), (2), (A) and Claim 47, (a), (2), (A): “desired” is vague and indefinite, in that the nature of the ”desired” color is not described.

B) Claim 2: the meaning of “for use” is not clear.

C) Claims 40, 41, 49 and 50: there is no antecedent basis for step.

2. Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 15-17, 20 and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1762

The instructions in the amendment filed 3/22/1999 are not clear; which instance of liquid carrier is meant (17:28) ? These instructions have not been deleted.

3. Claims 1 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the composition as claimed in Claim 1 as originally filed, does not reasonably provide enablement for the broader composition of Claim 1 or Claim 47. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

4. Claim 1 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1: "...powder in an amount sufficient to fuse into and form a permanent bond with the molded polyethylene article..." and

Claim 47: "...a binder to provide the decorative enhancement composition with temporary adherence..." and

Art Unit: 1762

Claim 47: "...powder that is adapted to fuse into and form a permanent bond with the molded polyethylene article..."

are new matter, not supported by the application as originally filed.

#### *Claim Objections*

5. Claims 1, 46 and 55 are objected to because of the following informalities: These claims lack a period. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1762

7. Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 15-17, 20 and 39-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 96/23041.

'041 teaches a thermoplastic spray material for bonding to polyethylene (p4) where the composition comprises 5-95% polyethylene powder with particle size less than 50 microns (p18-19), organic or inorganic pigments or mixtures, organic solvents or water or mixtures (p19), and resin particles such as rosins or hydrocarbon resins (p21). After application to a surface, the composition is heated (p20).

The composition of '041 overlaps with applicant's claimed ranges.

The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the overlapping portion of the range disclosed by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness. See *In re Malagari* 182 USPQ 549.

'041 does not teach a clear overcoat, but a color-plus-clear type of surface coating is conventional to the art, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have added a protective clear overcoat to the pigmented coating of '041, for protection.

The present application is not entitled to the filing date of 08/566906 because the present application recites a coating composition and process (20-90 percent liquid carrier, 9-50 %

Art Unit: 1762

colorant + 50-91 % of binder and particulate thermoplastic powder , to be applied to a molded article) that is different from that of 08/566906 (thermoplastic or thermosetting resin, liquid carrier, binder solid and optional colorant, to be applied to a mold surface). See MPEP 201.11.

*Conclusion*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erma Cameron whose telephone number is (703) 308-2330.

*Erma Cameron*  
ERMA CAMERON  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 1100

Erma Cameron

December 3, 1999